## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

In re Appeal No:

652-51 in the United States

Patent and Trademark Office

In re application of: Ole K. Nilssen

Serial No:

06/541,489

Filed:

October, 13, 1983

Entitled:

ELECTRONIC BALLAST FOR FLUORESCENT LAMPS

### NOTICE OF APPEAL

I, Ole K. Nilssen, herewith appeal <u>pro se</u> to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit to review the decision of the Board of Appeals of the United States Patent and Trademark Office; which decison affirmed the rejection of claims 48-51 in subject application.

A copy of the Notice of Appeal submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office is herewith enclosed, as is a check (#2442) in the amount of \$100.00 to cover the appelate court docket fee.

Ole K. Nilssen, Pro Se Appellant

Date.

Ole K. Nilssen

Caesar Drive

Barrington Hills, Illinois 60010

Telephone: 312-658-5615

OLE IK NILSSEN  PAY TO THE CORPORATION HILLS, IL 600110	
September 5 87 3.5 PROWS	
PROVIDENT NATIONAL BANK  17th & CHESTNUT STREETS PHILADELPHIA, PA 19101  In re 652-51 at the pro  100.00  Asset Reserve Account  100.00  Asset Reserve Account  100.00  110.00	

•

// - - + + + · ·

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

## In re Appeal No. 652-51

In re Application of: Ole K. Nilssen

Entitled:

ELECTRONIC BALLAST FOR FLUORESCENT LAMPS

Serial Number:

06/541,489

Filed:

10/13/83

Art Unit:

266

Examiner:

LEO H. BOUDREAU

NOTICE OF AND REASONS FOR APPEAL TO

THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

I, OLE K. NILSSEN, HEREWITH CERTIFY THAT THE DATE OF DEPOSIT WITH THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE OF THIS PAPER OR FEE

ic.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

#### Commissioner:

In response to Paper No. 17 dated 08/28/87, wherein the BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES (Board) denied Applicant's request for reversing its affirmation of Examiner's rejection of claims 48-51 of subject application, Applicant herewith gives notice to the Commissioner that appeal is taken to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC).

Appeal to the CAFC is taken for the following reasons.

- a) The Board erred in affirming Examiner's rejection of claims 48-51 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Nilssen in view of Agnew, both of record.
- b) More particularly, the Board erred in holding that the applied references provided sufficient motivation for seeking to attain the claimed invention.

- c) The Examiner erred in not describing -- in a manner that could readily be understood by a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art -- how he would propose to combine Agnew with Nilssen in such manner as to attain the claimed invention.
- d) The Commissioner erred in not providing competent examination of the application.
- e) More particularly, the Commissioner erred in allowing the application to be examined by persons manifestly lacking ordinary skill in the art to which the application and claimed subject matter pertain.

Ole K. Nilssen, Pro Se Appellant

9-5-87

Date:

312-658-5615